

Dr. sc. Ranka Jeknić: Gender equality, young women and culture in the context of the “masculinity...
Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Splitu, god. 51, 3/2014., str. 681.- 696.

Dr. sc. Ranka Jeknić, senior assistant
University of Split Faculty of Law

GENDER EQUALITY, YOUNG WOMEN AND CULTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE “MASCULINITY/ FEMININITY” AS A DIMENSION IN GEERT HOFSTEDE’S MODEL OF “NATIONAL CULTURE”*

UDK: 342. 7 (497., 5)

Pregledni rad

Primljeno: 1. 02. 2014.

This paper analyzes the issue of gender equality and the relationship between the young women and culture in the context of the “masculinity/femininity” as a dimension in Geert Hofstede’s model of “national culture”. This dimension represents the level that explains whether the society prefers values which Hofstede associates with “masculinity” or “femininity”. Some criticism to Hofstede is than presented, such as his slipping into biological determinism and gender stereotypes. Then, some of the research results conducted in Croatia according to Hofstede’s model are presented. That research placed us among more “masculine” societies. This fact is then compared with the results of other studies of youth values which determined the higher expression of religious attitudes, and a more traditionalistic and conservative orientation of youth in Croatia. Finally, the conclusions are drawn in the context of the evaluation of this dimension with the final aim of examining its value and contribution in theoretical, methodological, and applicational aspect.

Key words: *Culture, Geert Hofstede, “masculinity”, “femininity”, youth values in Croatia, gender equality, gender stereotypes.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Geert Hofstede’s model of “national culture” is one of the most famous research models of culture that is based on the intercultural meaning of culture¹, and emphasizes cultural diversity and the equivalence of cultures and their dialogue, therefore, can be related to cultural relativism and cultural pluralism which UNESCO promotes from the time of its founding². This model was created while Hofstede conducted a large research project entitled “Hermes” which involved approximately 116,000 questionnaires about values and attitudes related

¹* This paper was presented at the International Scientific Conference „Young Women and Gender Equality in Post-Yugoslav Societies: Research, Practice and Policy“, Zagreb, Croatia, November 26 – 27, 2013.

There are three basic meanings of modern culture arising from a general dynamics of western civilization: that of Enlightenment, the national, and the intercultural (Katunarić, 2007).

² It can be read from the following official documents of UNESCO: “Our Creative Diversity” (1996), “Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity” (2000), “UNESCO and the Issue of Cultural Diversity: Review and strategy, 1946-2000” (2000), “Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue” (2009) etc.

to work and the workplace, divided to IBM employees in fifty countries and three regions³, at two points in time (1968 and 1972) (Hofstede, 1983).

Hofstede defines culture as „collective programming of the mind“, or „software of the mind“, whereby the phrase “mental programming” is not interpreted literally that people are programmed in the same way as a computer, but it is a theoretical construct by which Hofstede assumes that „each person carries a certain amount of mental programming that is stable over time and leads to the same person’s showing more or less the same behavior in similar situations” (Hofstede, 2001: 2). Actually, „every person carries within him – or herself certain patterns of thinking, feeling, and potential acting that were learned throughout lifetime“, and „much of it has been acquired in early childhood“, when everyone is going through a period of primary socialization (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005, 2). Culture is therefore relatively permanent and stable; „a collective, not an individual attribute“; „common to some, but not all people“; shared by individuals and groups within society; differs from the other „mental software“; learned in the process of socialization; „not directly visible but manifested in behaviours“; her core is formed by values (Hofstede, 2007: 16).

2. HOFSTEDE’S „MASCULINITY/FEMININITY“ DIMENSION

“Masculinity/femininity” dimension⁵ refers to the extent to which culturally determined gender roles play an important role in society, or in other words „it is the degree to which values like assertiveness, performance, success and competition“, which Hofstede associated with masculinity, „prevail over values like the quality of life, maintaining warm personal relationships, service, care for the weak, and solidarity“, which he associated with femininity (Hofstede, Soeters, 2002: 7). To Hofstede, „a society is called masculine when emotional gender roles are clearly distinct: men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success, whereas women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life“; „a society is called feminine when emotional gender roles overlap: both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life“ (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005: 120).

³ With the later adding of replications and estimates, the total number of analyzed countries to 2005, will amount to seventy-one country and three regions: Arab-speaking countries, East Africa, and West Africa (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005).

⁴ Hofstede distinguishes five main dimensions on which “national cultures” differ: “power distance“, „individualism/collectivism“, „masculinity/femininity“, „uncertainty avoidance“ and „long-term/short-term orientation“ (Hofstede, 2001).

⁵ Hofstede’s “masculinity/femininity” dimension „was originally identified from a section in the values questionnaire that asked for the importance to the respondent, in an imaginary ideal job, of 14 work goals“: „challenge, (living in a) desirable area, earnings, cooperation (with colleagues), training, (fringe) benefits, recognition, physical (working) conditions, freedom, (job) security, (career) advancement, use of skills, (relationship with) manager, and personal time (for personal or family life)“, and their statistical analysis produced two factors: individual/collective and social/ego (Hofstede et al., 1998: 7-8).

Exploring the specified dimension Hofstede created six sub-dimensions of masculinity, and the same number of sub-dimensions of femininity, while the “sub-dimensions of masculinity are defined as: a) ambition and excellence, b) tendency of polarizing, c) 'live in order to work', d) 'big is beautiful', e) success is amazing and f) determination and factuality“; the sub-dimensions of femininity are defined as: “a) quality of life and serving others, b) reliance on majority, c) 'work in order to live', d) 'small and slow are beautiful', e) sympathy for the unpredictable and f) intuition rather than facts“ (Mijatović, Žužul, 2004: 58).

Besides that, “masculinity/femininity” dimension, though equally important and interesting in cultural and anthropological sense as “individualism/collectivism”, in contrast to this dimension, has not been connected to the national wealth of countries, nor opposes the West to East (Hofstede, 2001). To Hofstede, there are as many wealthy as poor, eastern as western, masculine and feminine societies (Hofstede, 2001). Masculinity/femininity dimension “separates countries in an entirely different way from individualism/collectivism”, for example, “in Europe it separates Austria (masculine) from Sweden (feminine); in Asia, Japan (masculine) from Thailand (feminine) and in Latin America Venezuela (masculine) from Costa Rica (feminine)“ (Hofstede, 2007: 20). However and although this dimension reduced the differences between the countries, “masculinity/femininity” dimension is less used and analyzed in a cross-cultural studies (Hofstede, 2007). Moreover, she provoked strong reactions, especially in cultures that have been described as “masculine”, and in which this dimension was judged as politically incorrect and often avoided even in replications, hence the appropriate subtitle of the book is: „Masculinity and femininity: the Taboo Dimension of National Cultures“ (Hofstede et al., 1998).

The following highlights some of the theoretical connotations on “masculinity/femininity” dimension, particularly interesting in terms of gender roles, family and education⁶.

In “masculine cultures” values like challenge and recognition in jobs, earnings and advancement are important. Gender roles in society are strictly differentiated: men should be assertive, ambitious and tough, while women are supposed to be tender and take care of relationships. Values of women and men are very different: being responsible, decisive and ambitious is for men, while being caring and gentle is for women. In the family fathers deal with facts, and mothers with feelings; children are socialized toward a strong, traditional differentiation between the genders; traditional family concepts are preferred. In education, best student is the norm; men and women study different subjects; women mainly teach younger children and men teach at universities. The most “masculine countries” from the Hofstede’s IBM database (above 66 index scores) were Japan, Austria, Venezuela, Switzerland, Italy, Mexico, Ireland, Jamaica, Germany etc. (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005: 120).

⁶ Key differences between “feminine” and “masculine” cultures are cited according to Hofstede, G. (2001) *Cultures Consequences*, p. 298-323.

In “feminine cultures” values like cooperation at work, employment security and quality of life are important. Gender roles in society overlap: both men and women should be modest; men should be tender and take care of both performance and relationships, and women should be the same. Values of women and men are hardly different: being responsible, decisive, ambitious and caring, and gentle is for women and men alike. In the family, both fathers and mothers deal with facts and feelings; children are socialized toward a weak, nontraditional gender differentiation; flexible family concepts are preferred. In education, average student is the norm; men and women partly study the same subjects; women and men teach younger children. The most “feminine countries” from the Hofstede’s IBM database (below 33 index scores) were Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, Denmark, Costa Rica, Finland, Chile, Portugal etc.⁷ (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005: 121).

3. CRITICAL REMARKS TO HOFSTEDE’S „MASCULINITY/ FEMININITY“ DIMENSION

Regarding to the criticism⁸ that can be refer to “masculinity/femininity” dimension, we will start from the criticism of labeling this dimension. Similarly, Schooler points on “the nature of the relationships between the questionnaire items and the concepts they are supposed to measure”, because, “masculinity-femininity” dimension was originally labeled “ego-social” for its “factor loadings apparently contrasted ego-enhancing and socially comforting work goals”⁹ (Schooler, 1983: 167). To Schooler, this was a better solution in terms of labeling of this dimension, because seemingly small change in “names represents a profound shift in level of generalization” (Schooler, 1983: 167). In addition, some criticized Hofstede for promoting gender stereotypes and perceive it as “being sexist”, which could relatively easily be solved, according to Adler, by changing the name of the dimension to “career success/quality of life to avoid confusion” (Adler, in: Chiang, 2005: 1547).

⁷ According to Hofstede, Croatia is situated in a group of countries of moderate “femininity”, but this is his estimation that could be criticised. In fact, one of his “biggest failures” is the examination of workers in Kragujevac, on basis of which he concludes “about the characteristics of the national culture of the former Yugoslavia” (Katunarić, 2007: 180). According to these data, the former Yugoslavia belonged to “feminine” countries (21 index points) (Hofstede, 1983). After the breakup of Yugoslavia, Hofstede divided respondents of this sample into three nationalities and according to their responses calculated following average index points: Slovenia (19), Croatia (40) and Serbia (43) (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005: 121).

⁸ Criticism that can be addressed to Hofstede’s model may also be applied to the “masculinity/femininity” dimension: criticism of the methodology of the model (such as a critique of the non-representativeness of the sample), criticism of some theoretical settings (such as the criticism of his deterministic understanding of culture), and criticism of some Hofstede’s interpretations (by which Hofstede in his conclusions exceeds the limit determined by collected data).

⁹ These are the following questions from the “VSM 94”: how important is to “work with people who cooperate well with one another”; to “have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs”; how much agreement with the statement that “most people can be trusted”, and that “when people have failed in life it is often their own fault” (Hofstede, 2001: 494-496).

The following critique refers to Hofstede's slipping into biological determinism. Specifically, interpreting the differences in behavior between men and women, Hofstede refers to the biological arguments, and thus falls into the trap of essentialist biological interpreting of differences between the sexes, opening in that way, space for criticism: „Of course, there is a common trend among the vast majority of societies, both traditional and modern, as to the distribution of sex roles apart from procreation: men must be more concerned with economic and other achievements and women must be more concerned with taking care of people in general and children in particular. *It is not difficult* to see how this role pattern fits with the biological sex roles: women first bear children and then breast-feed them, so they must stay with them....The common pattern of male assertiveness and female nurturance leads to male dominance at least in matters of politics and, usually, of economic life; within the household, whether this be a nuclear or an extended family group, different societies show different distributions of power over the sexes“ (Hofstede, in: Ailon, 2008: 896). According to Ailon, this citation in which Hofstede explains how the different social roles of men and women, are matched with different biological roles, clearly indicates that Hofstede's „distinction between masculine assertiveness and feminine nurturance is hardly neutral – if not in essence then in effect“ (Ailon, 2008: 896). In this citation “the biological sexual differences is enacted as an underlying reason” that women are excluded or subordinated in the political and economic spheres as ones that „*must* stay at home“, while „men *must* be more concerned with economic and other achievements“ (Ailon, 2008: 896). To Ailon, his slipping into biological determinism is even more apparent in the next citation: „The goals of organizations affect the distribution of labor over the sexes. Business organizations have goals of achievement which concur with the achieving role of the male. *It is not surprising* that they are almost always led by men and that their climate is set by men....In contrast to business organizations, hospitals have a quite different set of goals, which concurs more with the traditional, nurturing female role. Women do take, and always have taken, management positions in hospitals, at least on the nursing side¹⁰“ (Hofstede, in: Ailon, 2008: 896). From the above citations, Ailon concludes that Hofstede „labeled the index on the basis of the Western stereotypical polarization of the sexes that was characteristic of the time“, and endorsed „a world view that naturalizes sexual inequality and occupational segregation“, therefore „reaffirms the sense of essentialist distinction on which the traditional world order is built“ (Ailon, 2008: 896-897).

Furthermore, using a questionnaire based upon the Hofstede's work¹¹, Gunkel and associates investigated and during 2007 examined and tested the relevance

¹⁰ Hofstede presents various examples and concludes that women dominate as doctors in Russia, as dentists in Belgium, “men dominate as typists in Pakistan, and form a sizable share of nurses in the Netherlands, female managers are virtually nonexistent in Japan but frequent in the Philippines and Thailand” etc. (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005: 117).

¹¹ They used a Hofstede's questionnaire to which they added demographic questions and conducted „640 valid responses: 64 from China, 312 from Germany, 64 from Japan and 200 from the USA“ (Gunkel et al., 2007: 62).

of using following gender stereotypes¹²: *Stereotype 1*: “men are perceived to be strong, active, assertive, competitive and tough, and are characterized by focusing on dominance, autonomy, aggression and economic achievements”; *Stereotype 2*: “women are best suited for the tender roles, that is, to tend to the care of the home, to children and to people in general. Thus, women are more concerned with nurturance, affiliation, deference and the quality of family life”; *Men’s goals*: “men consider challenge, earnings, advancement, recognition, training, work autonomy and the use of their skills to be more important work goals than do women”; *Women’s goals*: “women consider co-operation, relationship with immediate managers, a desirable living area, fringe benefits, physical working conditions, job security and personal time to be more important work goals than do men” (Gunkel et al., 2007: 60). Summarizing their results, researches founded “a number of differences between men and women in the importance they attach to work-related goals”, but the gender stereotypes and stereotyped goals „are supported neither in general, nor by specific country analysis, nor by sub-category intra-country position analyses“ (Gunkel et al, 2007: 75).

4. USING HOFSTEDE’S „MASCULINITY/FEMININITY” DIMENSION IN CROATIA

According to Hofstede’s model and procedure, our scientists have conducted an empirical research, the results of which date from the late 1998, on a sample of 3970 high school students, 2011 of their parents and 371 teachers working in 42 secondary schools surveyed in 26 Croatian cities (Mijatović, Žužul, 2004). It was a research and an application of Hofstede’s model in upbringing and education, and such application may be interesting and may have “potentially multiple benefits”: firstly, it stirs an „interest for the model of culture meaning that can connect different types of multicultural organizations and programs” from multinational companies to multicultural school programs; secondly, the use of such cross-cultural research model enables a comparison with others; thirdly, a school is like a labor organization for both students and teachers, but also for parents, and besides that, it is a place of socialization and the construction and adoption of values, norms and attitudes not only about the school, but also about other institutions and processes; fourthly, “students are the future citizens of Croatia”, or its future employees, managers, etc., and fifthly, such strict application of the model not only on a sample of students, but also of the teachers and parents alike, provides and allows making of “more general conclusions on Croatia’s sociocultural environment” (Katunarić, 2007: 184).

According to the above model (over 66 index points include countries with

¹² According to Gunkel and associates, Hofstede supports gender stereotypes with his IBM research findings “that men valued advancement, earnings, training and up-to-datedness more than did women; whereas women valued a friendly atmosphere, position security, physical conditions, a positive relationship with their supervisor, and co-operation with colleagues more highly than did men” (Gunkel et al., 2007: 58).

expressed “masculinity”, and below 33 index points the countries of expressed “femininity”), the research allocates Croatian high school students as per “masculinity” index (72.6) among the countries with predominant “masculinity” such as Switzerland (70), Germany (65), Italy (70), Ireland (68); indices of parents and teachers “masculinity” are a little higher, with 73 index points for parents and 75.2 for professors, and a common level of all three groups of participants is 73 index points (Mijatović, Žužul, 2004: 58).

We will emphasize below some of the data indicating the “femininity” of our culture. According to the results for the statement by which the “financial security and emotions of the child should be taken care of by both mother and father”, 93.4% of students had agreed, along with 95.1% of parents and 98.1% of teachers, clearly indicating a high level of “femininity” (Previšić, Mijatović, 2001: 29). A statement that “both girls and boys should cry” also points out to a similar trend, meaning that 90% of students, 91.6% of parents and 97.4% of professors agree with it (Previšić, Mijatović, 2001: 29). Furthermore, the statement that “the conflict should be resolved through negotiation and compromise (and not by direct confrontation)”, is agreeable by 77.9% of students, 91.7% of parents and 97.3% of professors (Previšić, Mijatović, 2001: 29). There is also a high percentage of agreement with the statement that “compassion and concern for others is a desirable virtue”, meaning that 86.3% of students, 80.8% of parents and 75.7% of professors agree that “one should first help the weak, less able (without favoring the strongest and the most capable)”, as they do with the statement that “a substantial part of the national wealth should be collected for helping the poor” (Previšić, Mijatović, 2001: 29).

However, some of the claims on which the opinions are divided can be singled out. For example, about half of all participants agree with the statement that “there should be as much top grade students in the classroom as possible”, which can be associated with “masculinity”, but an equal number of participants believe that “there should be as much mediocre (average) students in the classroom as possible”, a trait of the “femininity” (Previšić, Mijatović, 2001: 29). A similar divide of participants is also found with an assertion about “whether the failure (bad score) in school is a disaster” or a “a minor issue”, as well as with the assessment about “whether a teacher should be a good expert in their class” or “a nice person”, with both virtues of professors receiving equally high rates (Previšić, Mijatović, 2001: 30).

The above-mentioned study places Croatia among the more “masculine” countries, so the obtained results can be compared to the results of the study “The value system of youth and the social changes in Croatia”¹³, which had been undertaken in the late nineties of the 20th century. The subject of the research itself are the value systems and some forms of behavior in the context of major social changes in transitional Croatia, and more than half of the variables used in

¹³ The research was conducted on a representative sample of young people which included 1700 respondents aged between 15 and 29 (Ilišin, Radin, 2002: 20-21).

the questionnaire is identical to those applied in the study of the youth of Croatia in 1986 “Location, awareness and behavior of the young generation of Croatians”, and so the results obtained in the tests in 1986 and 1999 are comparable¹⁴ (Ilišin, Radin, 2002: 13). In this regard it is important to emphasize that researchers have found a great rise of the values associated with tradition, nationality and religion (Ilišin, Radin, 2002: 305). In other words, research has found that young people are much more religious than at the late eighties, and given that “there was a process of retraditionalization at work in Croatia, its effect manifested through the expression of emphasized traditionalist orientation of a significant part of contemporary youth” (Ilišin, Radin, 2002: 312). Another study “Youth and European integration processes”¹⁵ conducted on 2004, confirmed that “young people in Croatia accept the traditional values somewhat less than the older”, but have in some areas, “at the same time shown to be more conservative than their European peers” (Ilišin, Radin, 2007: 28). That study provides a comparative analysis of the previously mentioned data, because more than half of the variables in the questionnaire are identical to those applied in the study of youth on 1999 (Ilišin, Radin, 2007: 20). It is important to emphasize that the comparison of the results of 1999 and 2004 research, points to “the strengthening trend of the young people’s call for so called more modern option of social development” (Ilišin, Radin, 2007: 273). Still, with “the reported increase in acceptance of the need for greater involvement of women in political decision-making process” the researchers have established “the importance of the discriminatory impact of gender characteristics”, meaning that the gender affiliation proved to be a key explanatory variable (Ilišin, Radin, 2007: 273). In this regard the researchers conclude that “despite the high overall commitment of the young generation to the values of gender equality¹⁶, established gender differences should be seen as an

¹⁴ Between these studies, Croatia has seen great changes, and it was a time of war and the postwar period, and of the transition which did not mean just leaving the old system, but also the construction of a new political, economic and ideological one. In fact, at that time there was a “new political order nominally based on liberal democratic values” established, and it implied “the acceptance and development of the market economy, political pluralism and tolerance as well as respect for human and minority rights” but in reality there was a “dominant idea and practice of establishing an ethnically homogeneous state, backed by promotion of national integration and revitalization of traditionalist values” (Ilišin, Radin, 2002: 304). All this was accompanied by an uneven social and political development, poverty, high economic inequality, etc., and it influenced the hierarchy values and orientation of youth, who at that time went through the process of socialization (Marinović Jerolimov, 2002: 120). In addition, “value-wise, except for the national-religious identification”, the society did not “offer the youth another coherent value foothold that would prepare them for the further development of a democratic, pluralistic, civil society” and there is a reasonable question if the “grown religiosity of youth (and other populations in Croatia) is in large part an expression of acceptance the only one offered, traditional value (national-religious) identification form?” (Marinović Jerolimov, 2002: 120).

¹⁵ The study was conducted on a representative sample of young people encompassing 2000 respondents aged between 15 and 29 and a control sample of older people encompassing 1000 respondents over 30 years of age (Ilišin, Radin, 2007: 21).

¹⁶ The “gender equality” was chosen with 78.7% of young people as being “very important” and 15.9% as “mostly important” value of the social and political order, with similar results by which this value was “very important” to 79.1% of the older population, while 16.5% of them saw the value as “mostly important” (Ilišin, Radin, 2007: 319-320). Furthermore, there are interesting data according to which 88.7% of youth and 91.1% of older population believes that “women’s rights” as human rights “should always be protected” (Ilišin, Radin, 2007: 317).

important interpretive framework that does not support the thesis of a value homogenization of gender when it comes to the dominant attitudes towards women's political participation” (Ilišin, Radin 2007: 273). Specifically, the established differences between young men and women indicate that the “young women are far more aware of their marginal position in social and political life” and expect more from the “social processes that should speed up the change in their position” (Ilišin, Radin, 2007: 273). Therefore, the researchers conclude that “gender/sex determinant nullifies the significance of almost consensual/declarative acceptance of the values of gender equality and women's human rights by pointing to the existence of patriarchal¹⁷ and discriminatory views”, thus “denying the thesis of a high level of gender awareness with most of the young generation¹⁸” (Ilišin, Radin, 2007: 273). Research of youth in Croatia from 2012¹⁹ indicates “weakening of the influence of tradition based on patriarchal relations” and the weakening of gender differences, which does not mean they have disappeared completely (Ilišin et al., 2013: 143). To Ilišin and associates, “the impact of gender differences is the smallest, or sporadically present and inconsistent”, which “clearly points out to the fruits of socialization that is more based on the promotion of gender equality than on the advocacy of gender stereotypes” and “in every new research of youth in Croatia, gender differences are in a decrease” (Ilišin et al., 2013: 143). However, the weakening of the differences does not mean that men and women are completely equal in Croatia. This is best evidenced by the results of the first scientific research on gender equality and discrimination in Croatia²⁰. According to this research, 59% of respondents believe that Croatia made progress in improving gender equality in relation to a decade ago, but very few of the respondents, namely 18.3% “believe that women and men in Croatian society are completely equal”, while 57.7% “do not think that men and women are completely equal in Croatia”, which clearly indicates that the inequality of women is still a significant problem in the Croatian society (Baranović, Leinert Novosel, 2009:

¹⁷ According to Tomić-Koludrović and Kunac, “patriarchal values and norms that are prevalent for the social position and self-reception of women in Croatia have several origins: 1. long-term effect of cooperative system of hierarchical authority, 2. long-term socialization in the system of socialist values, 3. long-term impact of Catholic notions of value, 4. impact of the war as eminently pre-modern paradigm, 5. the impact of current life situation (uncertainty, dropping of living standards, volatility of fundamental social values)” (Tomić-Koludrović, Kunac, 2000: 12).

¹⁸ Although the values of gender equality have been “almost consensually validated, perception of the general social status of women indicates that a large number of participants did not recognize different forms of unequal social status of men and women” (Štimac Radin, 2007: 171). For example, “the question aiming to detect awareness of gender inequality”, notably the “perception of young people on the social status of women in relation to men”, 41.2% of youth responded that they think women are disadvantaged compared to men in our society, while 54.2% believed them to be in the equal position, whereas 4.6% believed them to be in better position (Štimac Radin, 2007: 171-172). There is also an influence of gender variable noted, because “as much as 51% of women as opposed to 32% of men, believe that women are in disadvantaged social status as compared to men” (Štimac Radin, 2007: 171).

¹⁹ The study was conducted on a representative sample of young people encompassing 1500 respondents aged between 14 and 27 (Ilišin et al., 2013: 13).

²⁰ The study was conducted in 2009 on a national representative sample that included 1363 respondents aged between 15 and 89, and the results were analyzed in a scientific report “Gender Equality and Discrimination in Croatia” (ed. Kamenov, Galić, 2009).

258). Furthermore, analysis of views on gender equality shows that the respondents “have a more developed awareness of gender when it comes to the general issues of gender equality, as opposed to the rights of women and men in real situations”, or in short, that the gender equality is supported on the declarative level (Baranović, Leinert Novosel, 2009: 268). In terms of gender inequality, the most problematic is the family situation, then the work and education domains as well as politics, and below we will extract some data pertaining to gender inequality in the family and in education, since they are the key agents of socialization through which the young learn their gender roles. Specifically, this study showed that the families had not yet achieved equality between women and men, or “in most families, both partners are equally involved in making decisions and managing the family finances”, but the organization of daily life shows that “care about children still largely belongs to women – as perceived by over three quarters of the survey participants”, and that women do most of the housework, and that sons and daughters receive unequal treatment (Baranović, Leinert Novosel, 2009: 259). All of that can be connected to connotations of “masculinity” dimension, and it clearly indicates the dominance of traditional views²¹ that are even more present “in the countryside, among the least educated people, the elderly and in the southern regions of Croatia” (Baranović, Leinert Novosel, 2009: 260). Similar connection to the “masculinity” dimension is also found in respect of education. Although most of the respondents have an egalitarian attitude when it comes to general questions on incentive for education of both sexes, when it comes to specific situations the data show that “a significant number of respondents believe that men should take their education more seriously because they will one day be family providers, and should be more successful in stereotypically male matters (science and technical) because they need them more in their lives than women do”, and as much as 37% of them believe “that it is okay in classes to mostly portray women as sensitive and delicate, and the men as enterprising and courageous” (Baranović, Leinert Novosel, 2009: 260). The above confirms that “school education in Croatia promotes gender stereotypical choices of schools and stereotypical models of gender roles”, which is a finding that also indicates the “masculinity” dimension and the researchers were not surprised by that because similar conclusions were being indicated by other analyses of “the

²¹ The research results of women’s position in Croatia, conducted on a sample of 3200 women from four Croatian counties (Split-Dalmatia, Istria, City of Zagreb, Osijek-Baranja County) in 1999 were similar (Tomić-Koludrović, Kunac, 2000: 7). According to the authors, “as opposed to post-industrial societies where the growing processes of individualization have brought the traditional gender socialization, the life styles and understanding of marriage and gender roles into question, they still represent the basic patterns of behavior in Croatia” (Tomić-Koludrović, Kunac, 2000: 80). Women are considered to be “in charge of the housework and raising children, and their own self-reception is based on the fulfillment of the tasks related to marriage and family” (Tomić-Koludrović, Kunac, 2000: 80). According to this research, “the social position of women in Croatia at the end of the nineties is in many ways subservient to that of men”, and in spite of their “triple burden” (work, home, additional job), a prevailing “uniformed and stereotypical division of social roles contributes to the fact that Croatian women” still “primarily see themselves in the roles of mothers and wives” (Tomić-Koludrović, Kunac, 2000: 80).

importance of curricula, especially textbooks²² in the (re)production of traditional patterns of gender socialization at an early school age and the need for their reconstruction” (Baranović, Leinert Novosel, 2009: 261). However, the encouraging data shows that women, the younger and better educated people as well as the respondents from urban areas are prone to more egalitarian attitudes, but the data according to which the women themselves “support the promotion of the traditional image of a woman through education and stereotypical selection of schools” is less then encouraging (Baranović, Leinert, Novosel, 2009: 261).

5. CONCLUSION

Final evaluation of Hofstede’s “masculinity/femininity” dimension in the context of issues of gender equality and the relations between the young women and culture aims to judge its value and contribution in a theoretical sense, in the context of sociological theories of modernity and modernization, as well as in methodological and applicative terms. In theoretical sense, the above model of “national culture” can be compared to Inglehart and Welzel unified theory of modernization, cultural change and democratization, according to which the socio-economic modernization, cultural shift toward expressive values and democratization are the components of a process that is “human development” (Inglehart, Welzel, 2007: 17). According to their “revised theory of modernization” changes of values are generally predictable because they are associated with socio-economic development which brings the change in gender roles in the long-term (Inglehart, Welzel, 2007: 35). Thereby, the most important role in promoting gender equality is played by an emphasis on “expressive values”²³ (Inglehart, Welzel, 2007: 274). After all, Hofstede himself associates the values of “feminine cultures” with Inglehart’s “expressive values”, also connecting “masculine cultures” to

²² The results of analysis of gender (in)sensitive contents of literature textbooks in primary education show that women are more represented as “authors of lower classes textbooks while men are exclusively authors of higher classes textbooks”, which points out to “the stereotypical opinion that women are more related to children of lesser age than men” (Baranović et al., 2010: 356). In presenting of the family roles of men and women the role of mother is highlighted, and the women are related to the sphere of family and privacy and to the children, and greater emphasis in textbooks is given to sons, pointing to “the consistency of textbooks in promoting traditional models of gender roles” (Baranović et al., 2010: 364). Furthermore, textbooks still “contain the characteristics of stereotypical imaging of professional roles of female and male characters” and “the male characters appear as doctors and women as nurses” (Baranović et al., 2010: 363). Therefore, the analyzed textbooks promote “patriarchal image of gender identity where males dominate as persons whose power and superiority is evident” as well as traditional approach that can be recognized in different “dimensions of gender attribution of female and male characters: psychosocial characteristics, values, professional and family roles”, thus transferring to pupils the picture of “women as gentle, religious, loyal and caring persons who usually perform service tasks (eg. teachers, nurses, housewives)” (Baranović et al., 2010: 369).

²³ Inglehart and Welzel place the high income countries high on the dimensions of the „secular-rational and expressive values“ and this is especially true in the rich societies of Protestant Europe such as Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Finland, etc., being the countries of highest gender equality, and it is also interesting how the Hofstede’s research places them in the same cluster, where low levels of hierarchical distance, high individualism, the expressed features of femininity and low uncertainty avoidance dominate (Hofstede, 1983).

“survival values” (Hofstede, 2001: 298). However, although the “masculinity/femininity” dimension is not associated with the wealth of the country, Hofstede still concludes that it is “very unlikely that there will be changes in the direction of the values gathered by the dimension of femininity in poorer parts of the world for as long as the country remains poor” (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005: 162). That does not mean that in the future there will still not be equal amount of “masculine” and “feminine” cultures, because the value of Hofstede’s model lies precisely in “the affirmation of cultural relativism in the name of equality” (Katunarić, 2007), but it does not need to be emphasized that the establishment of “gender-egalitarian society” as an important connotation of “femininity” dimension, is one of the key objectives and priorities for the development of any modern society (Galić, 2009).

Methodological value and a contribution of Hofstede’s dimension is found in the relative accuracy of his data, confirmed by various replicating studies. Then, a use of this dimension allows us comparison with others, whereby the value of Hofstede’s model is found in the conclusions such as the one that “cultures are varied more in the regional than in the national sense” (Katunarić, 2007: 170). Therefore it would be interesting to conduct Hofstede’s model for describing and comparing the different Croatian regions and their moving “average tendencies”, which would probably lead to the image of “masculinity” and “femininity” of Croatia by which it would differ from other cultures, but would “inside, regionally, be more differentiated than from those other” cultures (Katunarić, 2007: 166). Actually, different studies that may be associated with the connotations of “masculinity” dimension have confirmed the regional differences²⁴, so in the previously shown study on gender equality, regions such as the North Croatia and the City of Zagreb show more of a modern orientation toward reproductive rights of women, more egalitarian attitudes related to gender in the labor market etc., while Dalmatia shows its “more traditional” face when it comes to perception of gender roles, the division between “male” and “female” occupations, etc. (Jelić, Huić, 2009 : 215).

Furthermore, it is important to emphasize what can and cannot be inferred by the use of this model. Specifically, the model should not be used as a framework for the description of the “typical national culture”, but “can be considered as explorative or orientation frame for further research and can in such way, longitudinally, repeatedly and in longer intervals, determine whether there are any ongoing or recurring behavior patterns in a particular environment”²⁵ (Katunarić,

²⁴ Regional differences were also found in the study “Sexist discourse of gender identity” conducted in 2004 on a representative sample of 1202 respondents, according to which the “most rigid regional sexism” was found in Lika and Banovina areas (Galić, 2009: 19).

²⁵ Hofstede has neglected the question of permanence and repetition of certain cultural traits, solving it partially by the “average tendencies” in culture, thereby easing the “image of the typical cultural characteristics”, stressing that in every culture there are significant differences and variations (Katunarić, 2007: 179). However, he does not deal with these differences and changes in culture and Hofstede is heavily criticized for his deterministic understanding of culture as static, stable and unchanging, and for the neglect of the concept of “meaning” and “action” which are important in the context of analysis of the culture and social change (Crespi, 2006; Kalanj, 2006). According to Kalanj, it can be easily explained by

2007: 182). Applicative value of the model can also be found in the possibilities of its application, such as previously presented research of the cultural identity of high school students in Croatia, which has placed Croatia among the more "masculine" countries²⁶. Thereby, we emphasize the warning of the researchers that the obtained data "represent a cross section of those groups only, and only at the time of testing" (Katunarić, 2007: 184). Katunarić therefore notes that this research "can not say what the real face of Croatian national culture is", or draw conclusions of "permanent" or "fixed" characteristics of our culture, but it can describe Croatian "national culture" in "average tendencies"²⁷, and it can describe it as a "floating balance of different tendencies" because "Croatia is rural and urban, conservative and liberal" and we might also add "masculine and feminine", as well as it is both modern and traditional when it comes to different concepts of social status of women²⁸ (Katunarić, 2007: 186). Furthermore, the task of upbringing and education is "value-normative" and its task is to influence the orientation molding which will enable students, or train them to "live in a democratic, pluralistic" and market-connected world, and then the question is asked what are these orientations and what are these values as well as the crucial

the view according to which it is an undisputed fact that each individual is born into a social context and in a culture in which he is socialized, but coming out of the socialization phase, "a conscious individual" will gain the ability "to give what he was transferred a particular meaning", and that meaning he can himself modify and create new ones for he "acts as a protagonist aware of the meaning and significance of his actions" (Kalanj, 2006: 208). In this regard, Kalanj emphasizes the importance of the concepts of "meaning" and "significance" as the key ones to understanding of the culture because "through them the features of cultural activities as social action come into expression" (Kalanj, 2006: 208).

²⁶ Research on matters of gender issues in the context of education shows the "feminization trend of teaching staff with a small number of women in positions of power" and the lack of "gender awareness training for future teachers, which is why the teaching process in interaction with students perpetuates traditional, stereotypical attitudes of the roles of men and women", and the application of "masculinity" dimension can yield guidance for the "implementation of a gender perspective in intercultural curriculum" (Bartulović, 2011: 170-180).

²⁷ Average tendencies of our culture have, according to previous studies, indicated certain ambiguities, so in terms of assessment of the "feminine" and "masculine" characteristics of our culture Katunarić concludes on "femininity in peace, and masculinity in the war", that is, on the distinctive features of "femininity" which are reflected in the importance of quality of life, caring for the poor, high percentage of highly educated women, etc., but indicates the changes in the direction of strengthening of "masculinity" characteristics in times of the rise of neoconservatism and its thesis on how "women should stay at home and against the abortion" (Katunarić, 1997: 24).

²⁸ In one of the first studies on position of women in transitional Croatia, the existence of "two almost contradictory concepts concerning the social role of women" was found: traditionalist, which "basically aims at bringing women back into the house, representing the 'naturalness' of such solution", and modernist, "wanting to enable women to choose their own path in life and to ensure equal opportunities and rights for all, regardless of gender" (Leinert Novosel, 1999: 7). According to the survey conducted in 1997 on a sample of 1300 respondents in the four largest cities in Croatia (Zagreb, Split, Osijek and Rijeka), "modernists compared to traditionalists are still twice as numerous" (Leinert Novosel, 1999: 205). By that, traditionalists believe "that the Church should have a crucial influence on the position of women in society" (28% of women, 34% of men), "the modernists" reject the claim that woman's place is primarily in the house, where they should take care of the household and raise children (65% of women, 51% of men)" (Leinert Novosel, 1999: 205). The result of research on 500 students at the University of Zagreb during 1998 is also interesting, and according to that, two crucial "factors that contribute to young people's adherence to one of these options" were observed: the first was the "influence of parents or a type of socialization in the family" (45% of women, 46% of men), and the other was a "media influence" (32% of women, 31% of men) (Leinert Novosel, 1999: 206-207).

educational question “what would be the desirable socio-cultural capital²⁹ of the young generation in Croatia?” (Katunarić, 2007: 185). According to the document *Croatia in the 21st Century – A Strategy of Cultural Development* (2003), the answer to that question would relate to the “desirable effects of the strategy” of cultural development in the direction of encouraging new initiatives and changes in the value orientations towards “femininity” or gender equality, supporting the weak, conflict resolution through negotiations, emphasis on quality of life etc. (Cvjetičanin, Katunarić, 2003: 91). But the question of where we are today and have we come any closer to these goals is not easily answered, and we constantly need to “question the cultural values (the dynamism of national culture)” (Cvjetičanin, Katunarić, 2003: 28).

REFERENCES

- Ailon, G. (2008) Mirror, mirror on the wall: cultures consequences in a value test of its own design, *Academy of Management Review*, 33 (4): 885-904. Retrived 5th October 2008, from <http://search.epnet.com>
- Baranović, B.; Doolan, K.; Jugović, I. (2010) Jesu li čitanke književnosti za osnovnoškolsko obrazovanje u Hrvatskoj rodno osjetljive?, *Sociologija i prostor*, 48 (2): 349-374.
- Baranović, B.; Leinert Novosel, S. (2009) Koliko su žene u Hrvatskoj ravnopravne?, u: Kamenov, Ž., Galić, B. (ur.) *Rodna ravnopravnost i diskriminacija u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb: Biblioteka ONA, Ured za ravnopravnost spolova Vlade RH, p. 255 – 269.
- Bartulović, M. (2011) Hofstedeova dimenzija muževnosti kao analitički okvir rodne jednakosti i seksualne različitosti, *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, 8 (2011): 171-183.
- Chiang, F. (2005) A critical examination of Hofstede’s thesis and its application to international reward management, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16 (9): 1545–1563. Retrieved 5th October 2008, from <http://search.epnet.com>
- Crespi, F. (2006) *Sociologija kulture*. Zagreb: Politička kultura.
- Cvjetičanin, B., Katunarić, V. (2003) *Hrvatska u 21. stoljeću – Strategija kulturnog razvitka*. Zagreb: Ministarstvo kulture.
- Galić, B. (2009) Društvena uvjetovanost rodne diskriminacije, u: Kamenov, Ž., Galić, B. (ur.) *Rodna ravnopravnost i diskriminacija u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb: Biblioteka ONA, Ured za ravnopravnost spolova Vlade RH, p. 9 – 27.
- Gunkel, M., Lusk, E. J., Wolff, B., Li, F. (2007) Gender-specific Effects at Work: An Empirical Study of Four Countries, *Gender, Work & Organization*, 14 (1): 56-79. Retrieved 5th October 2008, from <http://search.epnet.com>

²⁹ Under the socio-cultural capital, we imply “knowledge, skills and norms of behaviour that arise from specific dimensions of national culture” which are necessary for adaptation, work, communication and life in a multicultural world (Katunarić, 2007: 185).

Hofstede, G. (1983) *National Cultures in Four Dimensions. A Research – based Theory of Cultural Differences among Nations. International Studies of Management & Organization*, 13 (1/2): 46-74. Retrieved 2nd June 2004, from <http://search.epnet.com>

Hofstede, G., Arrindell A. W. (et all.) (1998) *Masculinity and femininity: the taboo dimension of national culture*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G. (2001) *Cultures Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G., Soeters, J. (2002) *Consensus Societies with Their Own Character: National Cultures in Japan and the Netherlands. Comparative Sociology*, 1(1): 1-16. Retrieved 2nd June 2004, from <http://search.epnet.com>

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. (2005) *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind, Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival*. UK: McGraw - Hill Companies.

Hofstede, G. (2007) A European in Asia, *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 1 (10): 16-21. Retrieved 5th October 2008, from <http://search.epnet.com>

Ilišin, V., Radin, F. (ur.) (2002) *Mladi uoči trećeg milenija*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja, Državni zavod za zaštitu obitelji, materinstva i mladeži.

Ilišin, V., Radin, F. (ur.) (2007) *Mladi: problem ili resurs*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja.

Ilišin, V., Bouillet, D., Gvozdanović, A., Potočnik, D. (2013) *Mladi u vremenu krize*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.

Inglehart, R., Welzel, C. (2007) *Modernizacija, kulturna promjena i demokracija. Slijed ljudskog razvitka*. Zagreb: Politička kultura.

Jelić, M., Huić, A. (2009) Usporedba rodne (ne)ravnopravnosti po područjima, u: Kamenov, Ž., Galić, B. (ur.) *Rodna ravnopravnost i diskriminacija u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb: Biblioteka ONA, Ured za ravnopravnost spolova Vlade RH, p. 209 – 224.

Kalanj, R. (2006) Argumenti za sociologiju kulture, u: Crespi, F. *Sociologija kulture*. Zagreb: Politička kultura, p. 194 – 210.

Katunarić, V. (1997) National Identity and Behavioural Patterns, u: Katunarić, V. (ed.) *Multicultural Reality and Perspectives in Croatia*. Zagreb: Interkultura, p. 13 – 28.

Katunarić, V. (2007) *Lica kulture*. Zagreb: Biblioteka Antibarbarus.

Leinert Novosel, S. (1999) *Žene na pragu 21. st. Između majčinstva i profesije*, Zagreb: Women group TOD.

Marinović Jerolimov, D. (2002) *Religioznost, nereligioznost i neke vrijednosti mladih*, u: Ilišin, V., Radin, F. (ur.) *Mladi uoči trećeg milenija*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja, Državni zavod za zaštitu obitelji, materinstva i mladeži, p. 79 – 124.

Mijatović, A., Žužul, A. (2004) *Prilog određenju dimenzionalnih značajki kulturnog identiteta srednjoškolske mladeži u Hrvatskoj. Pedagoška istraživanja*, 1(1): 41-65.

Previšić, V., Mijatović, A. (ur.) (2001) *Mladi u multikulturalnom svijetu. Stavovi srednjoškolaca u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb: Interkultura.

Schooler, C. (1983) Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values. *Contemporary Sociology*, 12 (2): 167. Retrieved 5th October 2008, from <http://search.epnet.com>

Štimac Radin, H. (2007) Politička participacija žena i rodna (ne)osviještenost mladih, u: Ilišin, V.; Radin, F. (ur.) *Mladi: problem ili resurs*, Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja, p. 157 – 177.

Tomić-Koludrović, I., Kunac, S. (2000) *Rizici modernizacije: žene u Hrvatskoj devedesetih*. Split: Udruga građana „Stope nade“.

RODNA RAVNOPRAVNOST, MLADE ŽENE I KULTURA U KONTEKSTU „MUŽEVNOSTI/ ŽENSTVENOSTI“ KAO DIMENZIJE MODELA „NACIONALNE KULTURE“ GEERTA HOFSTEEDEA

Problematika rodne ravnopravnosti i odnosa mladih žena i kulture u radu se analizira u kontekstu „muževnosti/ženstvenosti“ kao dimenzije modela „nacionalne kulture“ Geerta Hofstede. Navedena dimenzija predstavlja razinu koja objašnjava jesu li u društvu poželjnije vrijednosti koje Hofstede vezuje uz „muževnost“ ili „ženstvenost“. U tom se smislu Hofstedeu upućuju i neke kritike, poput skliznuća u biološki determinizam i rodne stereotipe. Zatim se prikazuju neki od rezultata istraživanja provedenog u Hrvatskoj prema Hofstedeovom modelu, a prema kojemu je Hrvatska smještena među zemlje izraženije „muževnosti“. Ti se rezultati potom uspoređuju s rezultatima drugih istraživanja vrijednosti mladih, a kojima se utvrdilo veće iskazivanje religioznosti, te tradicionalističko i konzervativnije usmjerenje mladih. Na kraju se izvode zaključci u kontekstu evaluacije navedene dimenzije, i to s ciljem prosuđivanja njene vrijednosti i doprinosa, kako u teorijskom, tako i metodološkom i aplikativnom smislu.

Ključne riječi: *Kultura, Geert Hofstede, „muževnost“, „ženstvenost“, vrijednosti mladih u Hrvatskoj, rodna ravnopravnost, rodni stereotipi.*